

VOLUME 13 · NUMBER 3 · SEPTEMBER 1959
230 PARK AVENUE · NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

POLITICAL MODERNIZATION AND RESEARCH ON THE PROCESS OF POLITICAL SOCIALIZATION

by Lucian W. Pye

A CONFERENCE on political modernization was held by the Council's Committee on Comparative Politics¹ at Gould House, Dobbs Ferry, New York, on June 8-11, 1959, for the purpose of discussing priorities in empirical research in its field. In preparation for the conference various background papers were solicited by the committee and distributed to the participants² in advance. A list of these papers appeared in *Items*, June 1959, page 17.

Since the committee was seeking guidance in planning further research, a brief review of its earlier work may give perspective for appraising the results of the conference. Out of the discussions and conferences held by the committee since its appointment in 1954, and from the substantive research it has sponsored, the outlines of a theory of comparative political systems have grad-

ually emerged.³ From the beginning the committee has sought a more dynamic approach to comparative politics, as a supplement to the traditional focus on formal, legal institutions of government. The search was not just for the lively aspects of politics, nor the factors "that lie behind the formal," but rather for the means to differentiate political systems as *wholes*.

The committee's interest in developing a more systematic concept of the political process led it to concentrate first on two efforts: on exploring the usefulness of applying to foreign societies the techniques and concepts that had been developed in study of the American political process; and on attempting to expand the range of comparative analysis by directing attention to the processes of political development in the new countries of Asia, Africa, and the Middle East.⁴

FIELD STUDIES OF POLITICAL GROUPS

When the committee turned to the problem of research priorities it seemed that the greatest returns might be expected from comparative studies of "political

¹ The members of the committee are: Gabriel A. Almond, Yale University (chairman); Taylor Cole, Duke University; James S. Coleman, University of California, Los Angeles; Herbert H. Hyman, Columbia University; Joseph G. LaPalombara, Michigan State University; Sigmund Neumann, Wesleyan University; Lucian W. Pye, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Robert E. Ward, University of Michigan; staff, Bryce Wood.

² The participants, in addition to members of the committee and staff, were: David Apter, Bert F. Hoselitz, Edward A. Shils, and Myron Weiner, University of Chicago; Wendell Bell, University of California; C. E. Black, Princeton University; George I. Blanksten, Northwestern University; Karl Deutsch and Walter R. Sharp, Yale University; Rowland Egger, University of Virginia; Rupert Emerson, Alex Inkeles, and Adam B. Ulam, Harvard University; William T. R. Fox, Columbia University; Everett Hagen and Daniel Lerner, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Pendleton Herring, Social Science Research Council; Avery Leiserson, Vanderbilt University; William W. Marvel, Carnegie Corporation of New York; Joseph J. Spengler, Duke University; Clarence Thurber, Ford Foundation; Kenneth W. Thompson, Rockefeller Foundation.

³ Summaries of the main currents of the committee's thinking can be found in the following articles: G. McT. Kahin, G. J. Pauker, and Pye, "Comparative Politics of Non-Western Countries," *American Political Science Review*, December 1955, pp. 1022-1041; Almond, Cole, and Roy C. Macridis, "A Suggested Research Strategy in Western European Government and Politics," *ibid.*, pp. 1042-1049; Almond, "Comparative Political Systems," *Journal of Politics*, August 1956, pp. 391-409; Almond, "A Comparative Study of Interest Groups and the Political Process," *American Political Science Review*, March 1958, pp. 270-282.

⁴ The first book to be sponsored by the committee will be *The Politics of the Underdeveloped Areas*, by Almond, Coleman, and Pye of the committee, George I. Blanksten, Dankwart A. Rustow, and Myron Weiner.

groups." The rationale for this focus emerged from the first research planning seminar sponsored by the committee in June 1956.⁵ In brief, it was thought that substantial returns might be realized from comparative studies of the varying ways in which political choice is organized in different political systems. Political groups were viewed as the actors or units that articulate, aggregate, communicate, and enforce political choice. This suggested the need for carefully planned studies of the systems of interest groups in most Western countries. It was recognized that in most non-Western areas the groups that perform these important functions of choice tend to be either the formal agencies of government, such as the bureaucracy or the officer corps, or such social entities as the tribe, the ethnic or religious communal group, a nationalist organization, or a Westernized leadership element. In order to stimulate research along these lines the committee sponsored a program of grants to individual scholars for field study of political groups during the academic years 1957-58 and 1958-59.⁶

During planning sessions in which recipients of the grants discussed with committee members ways of ensuring that their research would contribute to the comparative analysis of politics,⁷ the thinking of the committee was further advanced. In dealing with many quite different types of political systems, it was necessary to adopt a common orientation that would provide a basis for comparative analysis and at the same time not restrict the individual investigator. The need for some form of functional analysis became increasingly apparent. It was found helpful to view the political groups in terms of their relations to certain functions, which were assumed to be fundamental to all political processes. This marked a new stage in the intellectual history of the committee: we had begun by rejecting the comparative analysis of structures or institutions in favor of seeking ways of comparing total processes; this had led to the analysis of the "actors" in the process—political groups; but to achieve order and a basis for comparison it was necessary to posit certain universal functions of all political processes, some of which must be performed by one structure or another.⁸

⁵ Cf. Almond, "The Seminar on Comparative Politics, June 1956," *Items*, December 1956, pp. 45-48.

⁶ This program was described in "Grants for Field Studies of Political Groups," *Items*, March 1956, pp. 1-2.

⁷ Planning sessions on research in Western Europe were held at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, April 6-10, 1957; on research in Latin America at Michigan State University, June 28-30, 1957; and on the Middle East and Southeast Asia, at Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Endicott House, May 4-6, 1958.

⁸ The categories of functions used in the forthcoming volume, *The Politics of the Underdeveloped Areas*, are: A. *Input functions*: (1)

FUNCTIONAL APPROACH

TO POLITICAL PROCESSES

This concern with the relationship of function and structure developed in both the planning of field studies and the theoretical work the committee was sponsoring. In particular, a functional approach to the comparative study of political processes was advanced and further refined through efforts to establish a common framework for a number of memoranda on the politics of the various underdeveloped regions. This experience suggested that a functional approach might be particularly useful in studying the transitional systems of the newly emergent countries, and also in comparing the political systems of traditional societies and even of primitive societies with those of advanced industrial countries. Therefore, when the committee undertook to review its work and plan its next steps, a conference on the subject of political modernization seemed desirable and appropriate.

It is impossible in a brief report to summarize the wide-ranging discussions of the conference. Sessions devoted to theories about the processes of political modernization were followed by sessions on illustrative cases. Discussions of the political basis of democratic modernization focused on the processes of political socialization and recruitment. Attention was directed to possibilities for research on the role of ideology and nationalism in shaping the process of political modernization. Finally, the discussions turned to the importance of key institutions or political groups in the modernizing process.

POLITICAL SOCIALIZATION

Various themes which were suggestive for the committee's program were developed, but one theme became increasingly dominant: comparative study of the processes of political socialization is likely to be an extremely fruitful approach to understanding the dynamics of political modernization. This theme was introduced by Edward A. Shils in the initial session on the theory of political modernization, when he called for studies of (1) the qualities and qualifications of the leadership element in the new states, (2) the processes by which a citizenry is formed and new political groupings emerge, and (3) the role of intellectuals. These three subjects for research were seen to be related when viewed in terms of the processes of political socialization and recruitment to political roles. In later discussions of the authoritative institutions of government—the bureauc-

political socialization and recruitment, (2) interest articulation, (3) interest aggregation, (4) political communication; B. *Output functions*: (5) role making, (6) rule application, (7) rule adjudication.

racy and the military—it was suggested that attention should be focused not only on the backgrounds and training of recruits to these institutions, but also on the ways in which these institutions can in turn affect the development of a sense of citizenship on the part of the public.

The attention given to the possible contributions of research on the political socialization process to strengthening the field of comparative politics warrants devoting the remainder of this report to their consideration. It may be noted, first, that an emphasis on this process would be entirely consistent with the general line along which the committee's theoretical work has been proceeding. Indeed, political socialization and recruitment are key functions common to all political processes. The concept also seems to be of crucial importance for relating findings in the studies of political groups to the structure of society and the culture. The process of political socialization provides the link between the general culture and the political culture.

Research on comparative political socialization involves analyzing the processes by which individuals in different societies are inducted into their political cultures. This process may inculcate the values and orientations basic to the concept of citizen in the particular polity. In other societies, however, there may be no widely shared concept of citizenship, and the process may produce a more limited sense of political identity and a narrower definition of the political self. It can be assumed that in all societies the ways in which individuals become informed about the world of politics will condition their behavior as they become members of particular political groups.

Studies of the political socialization process may reasonably be expected to yield knowledge and insights about the diverse ways in which public opinion and social values are related to the patterns of development of political groups. In the study of Western political systems this may lead to better understanding of the relationships between interest group and party behavior, on the one hand, and the character of public opinion and the primary structure of the society, on the other. In study of the non-Western world it may be that examination of patterns of political socialization will help us to employ anthropological data and insights for systematic political analysis.

The political socialization process is closely associated, of course, with the basic processes of socialization of the culture; hence continuities exist between patterns of political behavior and other cultural patterns. However, by conceiving of a separate process of political socialization, there is less likelihood of overstating the nonrational components of political behavior, and thus ignor-

ing the importance of the rational cognitive element of learning that is also extremely important in determining political choice and action. Indeed, considering the political socialization process as distinct from other socialization processes may facilitate achieving a balanced view of the relative importance of the rational and conscious process of learning about the political sphere and the more subconscious and emotional determinants of political behavior.

Research on political socialization thus should lead to a better understanding of both the rational and the emotional factors that condition the process of recruitment to different types of active political roles. Comparative studies along such lines might suggest new hypotheses about differences in the actions of similarly structured groups. Finally, there is need to examine the ways in which those who are recruited to active political roles, operating through various types of groups and institutions, affect the continuing process of political socialization of the next political generation. Do the institutions of the society encourage continuity or are they agents of radical change, as they are in many of the newly modernizing countries? How effective can the various authoritative agencies of the government be in changing the pattern of political socialization and in thus producing a more widespread sense of democratic citizenship? The process seems to be extremely important in determining the course of nation building in socially disorganized societies. Studies of the political socialization process may contribute to a better understanding not only of the elements of stability but also of dynamics of change in political systems.

AGENCIES OF POLITICAL CHANGE

There is a significant relation between the committee's first program of grants for research on political groups in foreign areas and the interest in studies of political modernization developed at the conference. The first program concentrated on political groups as a way of studying the dynamics of political systems. The new approach is directed at the study of groups and institutions as agencies of political change. Furthermore, in the study of political groups the concern of the committee was still limited to essentially political phenomena. A study of political recruitment and socialization would open up the possibility of including studies of formally nonpolitical agencies, such as the educational system and the media of communication, viewed as instruments of political change.

Actually, the significant agencies of political socialization vary substantially from one political system to another. In a modernizing oligarchy such as Pakistan the

primary object of research might be the military and bureaucratic elite. The direction of political change under such a regime will depend in the first instance on the values, objectives, and methods of modernization of relatively small elite groups. In a tutelary democracy such as India where the norms of democracy are generally accepted, but where not all the institutions of democracy have as yet taken deep root, a much broader program of studies of recruitment and socialization into politics would be appropriate. Research would be concerned not only with the conceptions of political modernization among the bureaucratic elite, but the roles in the socialization process performed by political party and interest group elite, educators, journalists, and others.

Several points were made during the conference discussions as to the research problems that might arise in carrying out such a program. First, the sites chosen for study should be broadly representative of the main patterns of political modernization in the non-Western areas. Thus the research sites should include traditional authoritarian systems in which modernizing tendencies

are in their very beginnings, as well as modernizing oligarchies that are characterized by more rapid social mobilization and change. They ought also to include formally democratic systems representing different degrees of success in adapting democratic structures and diffusing a democratic political culture.

A second point was that the selection of such a focus would involve moving into an area in which the skills of the political scientist would have to be supplemented by those of the social psychologist, sociologist, and anthropologist. Two ways of coping with this problem were suggested. First, grants might be offered to scholars in these disciplines either to undertake individual research projects, or to collaborate with political scientists. Second, a training program might make use of such devices as summer research institutes; or opportunities might be made available for advanced training at universities where substantial research and teaching is under way in this field. The various proposals and suggestions made at the conference will be discussed and appraised by the committee in the fall.

RESEARCH ON COLLEGE INFLUENCES ON PERSONALITY: REPORT ON THE ANDOVER CONFERENCE, MARCH 26-28, 1959

by Lloyd Morrisett, Jr.

THE Council's Committee on Personality Development in Youth¹ held a second major conference on research on college influences on personality, at the Andover Inn, Andover, Massachusetts in March, to enable investigators who are planning or conducting studies of student change in college to share their plans and results and to discuss problems common to this area of research. The 51 participants represented 31 institutions or other agencies interested in personality development during the college years.²

¹ The members of the committee are: Ralph W. Tyler, Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences (chairman); Dana L. Farnsworth, Harvard University; Chester W. Harris, University of Wisconsin; T. R. McConnell, University of California, Berkeley; Donald G. Marquis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Theodore M. Newcomb, University of Michigan; C. Robert Pace, Syracuse University; Nevitt Sanford, University of California, Berkeley; and Robin M. Williams, Jr., Cornell University.

² Participants in the conference were: Robert C. Angell and Theodore M. Newcomb, University of Michigan; Mario Anglada and Millard Hansen, University of Puerto Rico; Howard S. Becker, Blanche Geer, and Peter New, Community Studies, Inc.; Charles E. Bidwell, Dana L. Farnsworth, Daniel H. Funkenstein, Stanley H. King, Gloria F. Leiderman, and Charles C. McArthur, Harvard University; Robert C. Birney, Haskell R. Coplin, and Robert F. Grose, Amherst College;

The Committee on Personality Development in Youth, as indicated in the report on the earlier conference,³ is broadly concerned with reviewing and sum-

Willard W. Blaesser, University of Utah; Burton R. Clark, Paul A. Heist, Nevitt Sanford, Martin A. Trow, and Harold Webster, University of California, Berkeley; Matthew Cullen, Ford Foundation; John T. Dailey, American Institute for Research; James S. Davie, Ernst Prelinger, and Ralph M. Rust, Yale University; Leonard J. Duhl, National Institute of Mental Health; Robert A. Ellis, Stanford University; Mervin B. Freedman, Vassar College; Helen Hofer Gee, Association of American Medical Colleges; Rose K. Goldsen, Cornell University; C. Hess Haagen, Wesleyan University; Chester W. Harris, University of Wisconsin; John L. Holland, National Merit Scholarship Corporation; Ira Iscoe, University of Texas; Frederick H. Jackson, Carnegie Corporation of New York; Lewis W. Jones, Tuskegee Institute; Robert R. Keim, Jr., U. S. Military Academy; Donald G. Marquis and Lloyd Morrisett, Jr., Social Science Research Council; Nahum Z. Medalia, Georgia Institute of Technology; C. Robert Pace and George G. Stern, Syracuse University; Walter T. Plant, San Jose State College; David R. Saunders, Educational Testing Service; Alice Y. Scates, U. S. Office of Education; Benson R. Snyder and Leila A. Sussman, Wellesley College; Ralph W. Tyler, Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences; and Lauren G. Wispe, Ohio State University.

³ Donald G. Marquis, "College Influences on Personality Development: Report of a Research Planning Conference," *Items*, September 1958, pp. 27-30.

marizing present knowledge relevant to its area, with stimulating research on personality development at educational institutions, developing concepts and measures for use in this research, and encouraging comparative studies at different institutions.

CHANGES IN RESEARCH

During the final session at Andover, Ralph Tyler, who acted as chairman of the conference, reviewed the research programs on which reports had been given and used the results to illustrate the progress that had been made during the past 25 years in research on impacts of higher education on personality. The relative sophistication of current descriptions of students and their college environments is noteworthy, in comparison with earlier, simpler descriptions. In addition to a description of educational achievement, the student, his college environment, and changes in his behavior are now characterized in anthropological, psychological, and sociological terms. Whereas students were formerly categorized as either prepared or unprepared for college, with reference to secondary curricula and grades, they are now described by means of batteries of ability, achievement, and personality measures, as well as by personal and social histories. Sanford's studies at Vassar College exemplify this complex descriptive analysis.⁴

In early studies the college environment was considered principally from the educational viewpoint, in terms of the nature of the curriculum and the quality of instruction. This conception of the college environment has been broadened to include such additional characteristics as student and faculty cultures, type of administrative control, and the degree of restrictiveness of college regulations. Peer cultures are now recognized as important both in the inception and mediation of college influences on personality. One conference session was devoted to consideration of research on peer cultures in colleges.⁵ Changes in the conceptualization of the college environment have been accompanied by changes in the methods used to describe it. These range from participant observation, which is being used by Everett Hughes, Howard Becker, and Blanche Geer at the University of Kansas, to psychometric techniques, as illustrated by the "College Characteristics Index," a multiple-item inventory, developed by C. Robert Pace, with which students describe their college environments.

⁴ Nevitt Sanford, Introduction to "Personality Development During the College Years," *Journal of Social Issues*, 1956, No. 4, p. 7.

⁵ An immediate result of this session has been a seminar sponsored by the committee and directed by Theodore M. Newcomb in the summer of 1959, at the University of Michigan, for the purpose of developing better methods of describing and assessing the roles of student cultures.

Finally, according to Mr. Tyler, the effectiveness of college education was formerly evaluated mainly in terms of grade-point averages and the number of entering students who graduated; now many intellectual and personality variables are being examined to ascertain the effects of college experience. Studies that attempt to assess student change have frequently depended on measures of personality variables as well as traditional measures of individual differences. Personality variables can, however, be divided into three classes: (1) variables that are stable and unlikely to change during the college years, (2) variables that change during the college years but are directly related to age, and (3) variables that are sensitive to college influences. It is important to include measures of all three classes of variables in research on student change, for while student change is central, interest is often focused on change among subgroups of students who have been classified on the basis of personality characteristics that are stable or directly related to age. Cross-sectional studies cannot distinguish between these three types of variables, and as a result not all measures derived from cross-sectional studies will be useful in detecting college influences on personality. Few investigators have looked for changes in I.Q. as a result of college experience, but other student characteristics which have been studied longitudinally may be similarly stable. Consequent failure to discern change over time could lead to the interpretation that college experience has little influence on personality. On the other hand, some failures to find changes over time may reasonably be interpreted as being due to inadequate measuring instruments. The development of improved measures, specifically designed to assess student change in college, is an integral part of several current research programs.

EXPERIMENTAL STUDIES

As the student, his environment, and the possible effects of college influence are described with increasing adequacy, it becomes important to relate these descriptions to each other, to explain how particular changes in behavior result from the interaction of students who have certain characteristics with specific aspects of the environment. For example, does living in a community of peers contribute more to increased social maturity than personal acquaintance with faculty members? Do part-time work experience and participation in extracurricular groups on campus contribute to the development of a realistic point of view? The traditional method for studying analogous questions in other areas has been the experimental. Barton concisely summarizes major difficulties in the application of this method when he says, "The fact that people select themselves to go or not

to go to college, and to take one or another course of study, is a basic obstacle to our following the model of the laboratory experiment with complete rigor in this field." ⁶ If high-school seniors were comprehensively studied and their later college and career decisions followed over a period of time, estimates could be made of the effects of self-selection for college. These estimates in turn would facilitate the interpretation of non-experimental college studies. The joint project of the University of Pittsburgh and the American Institute of Research on the identification, development, and utilization of human talents should supply much information useful for making estimates of the effects of self-selection for college.

While self-selection has prevented experimental study, with its randomized assignment of subjects, in the comparison of colleges, it does not necessarily prevent the use of the experiment in studying student change within a college. Two features of the situation at Austin College made experimental research possible there, and these are often found elsewhere: (1) the existence of more than one well-defined program within a college, and (2) more well-qualified applicants for one or more of these programs than can be accepted. If these conditions exist the participants in a program can be selected by a random procedure from qualified applicants, thus creating experimental and control groups. Honors programs, programs of independent studies, new dormitories, and special group-living arrangements frequently may provide these preconditions for experimentation. In fact, the extension of this experimental plan to entire schools is not unreasonable. Colleges of similar academic standing often receive applications from large numbers of the same students.

⁶ Allen H. Barton, *Studying the Effects of College Education* (New Haven: Edward W. Hazen Foundation, 1959), p. 59.

COMPARATIVE STUDIES

Where circumstances make experimentation either impractical or impossible, comparative research may allow the investigator to draw valid conclusions about the relations between the college, the student, and the effects of college experience on his personality. The value of a random assignment of subjects to conditions in an experiment is to ensure that subsequent differences among experimental groups will be due either to the experimental conditions, or with a known likelihood to a chance combination of irrelevant factors. In contrast, comparative research capitalizes on natural variation.

Currently one of the largest comparative studies is being carried on by T. R. McConnell and his collaborators at the University of California, Berkeley. They are investigating student change in institutions chosen to vary systematically both in institutional characteristics and student characteristics. At the time of the Andover conference Antioch College, Reed College, San Francisco State College, and Swarthmore College were included in this design, and a few more colleges were expected to be added. Comparative studies of course can be conducted within institutions as well as between institutions. Most longitudinal studies of student change within a single school are, in fact, comparative; they examine students under a variety of conditions within the college.

Most of the research that was discussed at the Andover conference was in a planning phase or in midstream. The studies represent a new wave of interest in college influences on personality. Compared to earlier studies, they are more sophisticated in methodology, more comprehensive in approach, and more comparable among themselves due to increasing similarity in instrumentation. During the next several years popular generalizations about colleges and their students may, as a result, undergo considerable modification.

Program: CONFERENCE ON RESEARCH ON COLLEGE INFLUENCES ON PERSONALITY

Andover Inn, Andover, Massachusetts, March 26-28, 1959

March 26, 9:30 A.M.

INTRODUCTION TO THE WORK OF THE CONFERENCE

Ralph W. Tyler, Chairman

CURRENT RESEARCH PROGRAMS

Amherst Study, Robert C. Birney
Yale Research Program, James S. Davie
San Jose State College Study, Walter T. Plant
Wesleyan Studies, C. Hess Haagen
Vassar Studies, Nevitt Sanford
Harvard Project on the Psychosocial Development of Students, Stanley H. King
Stanford Study of Social Differences in the Academic Success of College Undergraduates, Robert A. Ellis

March 26, 2:00 P.M.

CURRENT RESEARCH PROGRAMS (continued)

A Study of Differential Selectivity and Institutional Impact in Selected Colleges, Paul A. Heist
An Experimental Study of College Impact, Ira Iscoe
Research on the University of Michigan College Honors Program, Robert C. Angell
The Cornell Values Study, Rose K. Goldsen
The Study of Student Cultures and the Level and Direction of Academic Effort at the University of Kansas, Howard S. Becker
Association of American Medical Colleges Studies of Characteristics of Medical Students, Helen Hofer Gee

Implications of the Diversity of Students, Colleges, and Medical Schools, Daniel H. Funkenstein
The Identification, Development, and Utilization of Human Talents, John T. Dailey
College Environments and the Development of Talent, John L. Holland

March 27, 9:30 A.M.

THE SUBCULTURAL ENVIRONMENT OF THE INDIVIDUAL STUDENT
Theodore M. Newcomb, Chairman

March 27, 2:00 P.M.

MEASURING PERSONALITY CHANGES IN COLLEGE STUDENTS
C. Robert Pace, Chairman

March 28, 9:30 A.M.

MEASURING INDIVIDUAL DIFFERENCES AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS
Nevitt Sanford, Chairman

March 28, 2:00 P.M.

PROBLEMS IN CONDUCTING COLLEGE STUDIES
Dana L. Farnsworth, Chairman

GRANTS FOR LATIN AMERICAN STUDIES: A NEW PROGRAM OF THE SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL AND THE AMERICAN COUNCIL OF LEARNED SOCIETIES

A new program of grants to individual scholars for research in the social sciences and humanities relating to Latin America will be offered for three years beginning in 1959-60, under the auspices of a Joint Committee on Latin American Studies, recently appointed by the American Council of Learned Societies and the Social Science Research Council. The members of the committee are: Sanford A. Mosk, University of California, Berkeley (chairman); Frederick B. Agard, Cornell University; Robert N. Burr, University of California, Los Angeles; Henry P. de Vries, Columbia University; Lincoln Gordon, Harvard University; Irving A. Leonard, University of Michigan; Charles Wagley, Columbia University; Robert Wauchope, Tulane University. Funds for this program have been provided by the Carnegie Corporation of New York, and will be administered by the Social Science Research Council.

A former Joint Committee on Latin American Studies, maintained by these two Councils and the National Research Council during 1942-47, encouraged the development of research and personnel in Latin American fields, during the war years advised and assisted government agencies concerned with these fields, and sponsored publication of the *Handbook of Latin American Studies*. After 1947 several new university centers of Latin American studies were organized, but no national agency was formed for the collaboration of individuals or universities in the general development of the field.

In 1958 the American Council of Learned Societies, responding to scholarly initiative, sponsored two conferences of individuals concerned with Latin American studies in various disciplines. From the discussions at these conferences it was clear that scholars in the

humanities and social sciences would welcome the organization of a new joint committee to improve communication among those interested in research relating to Latin America, to consider ways in which the development of such research might be furthered, and to administer a program of grants for field research if funds could be obtained.

Under the new program, awards ranging from relatively small grants-in-aid of research to larger grants, providing for maintenance in lieu of salary and travel expenses for field research in Latin American countries, will be offered to scholars who possess the Ph.D. degree or its equivalent and who are citizens or permanent residents of the United States or Canada. Applications are invited for grants for research in all fields of the humanities and social sciences. Emphasis will be placed on research relating to postindependence and contemporary developments in any of the Latin American countries; particular attention will be given to proposals for research on Brazil.

Applications will be welcomed not only from scholars who have already specialized in Latin American studies, but also from others of established competence in their disciplines who wish to equip themselves for research on this area. Special consideration will be given to younger scholars who have had little opportunity for study in Latin American countries, and to those from institutions that do not possess special funds for Latin American research.

Requests for additional information and for application forms should be addressed to the Social Science Research Council, 230 Park Avenue, New York 17, N. Y. Inquiries should indicate briefly the nature of the

proposed research and the approximate amount of financial support contemplated, but need not include the detailed budgetary and other information that will be requested on the forms themselves.

Applications for grants for research to be undertaken in 1960 must be filed not later than January 4, 1960 on forms supplied by the Council; awards will be announced on or about March 15, 1960.

GRANTS FOR RESEARCH ON AMERICAN GOVERNMENTAL AND LEGAL PROCESSES: EXPANSION OF THE PROGRAM OF THE COMMITTEE ON POLITICAL BEHAVIOR

A PROGRAM of grants for research on American governmental processes will again be offered by the Social Science Research Council for a period of three to five years beginning in the autumn of 1959. As heretofore the program will be administered by the Committee on Political Behavior, with funds made available to the Council by the Ford Foundation. The new program includes special features intended to encourage research on legal processes and at the same time continues to offer awards for research on political processes of the types supported under the previous program, which was announced in *Items*, June 1956.

The new program offers support to social scientists and to legal scholars for studies of political and legal processes at various levels of government and with reference to various aspects of relationships among government officials, and between officials and private citizens and organizations.

The scope of research on governmental processes is viewed broadly by the committee, as may be seen from the range of research projects for which awards have been made during the past three years, as reported in various issues of *Items* and in the *Annual Reports* of the Council. The committee especially wishes to encourage proposals involving the use of field research techniques, such as interviewing and direct observation, but will also consider proposals calling for analysis of documentary materials.

To advance research on legal processes, it is hoped that legal scholars will apply for grants for research that requires analysis of trial records, administrative proceedings, or other documentary sources of which use is not customarily made, or for research designed to broaden the analysis of cases, as by attempting to determine effects of judicial decisions on economic, political, or social relations. Proposals that deal with legal processes and trends other than those relating directly to decisions of the United States Supreme Court will be of especial interest to the committee.

Social scientists having an interest in legal processes are invited to submit proposals that call for the use of field research techniques.

In addition to applications for support of research on political and legal processes by individuals, the committee will accept applications from scholars whose plans call for the cooperation of junior colleagues or the assistance of qualified graduate or undergraduate students for whose training the association would be advantageous. Particular attention will be given to applications from scholars in liberal arts colleges or other institutions that lack funds for support of research by faculty members.

Grants may be made for periods ranging from a semester to more than one year, and up to a maximum of about \$25,000 for collaborative studies. Grants may be used for maintenance of applicants and their colleagues, for the employment of research assistants, and for expenses such as travel and the processing of data. Applicants should not be candidates for an academic degree; and their qualifications will be judged on the basis of their previous research accomplishments.

Applications for support of research to be undertaken in 1960 must be submitted on forms supplied by the Council and must be received at the office of the Council not later than December 7, 1959. Decisions of the committee will be made known to the applicants not later than February 15, 1960. Inquiries and requests for application forms should indicate briefly the nature of the proposed research and the approximate amount of financial support required, but need not include the detailed budgetary and other information that will be requested in the forms.

SUMMER RESEARCH TRAINING INSTITUTE ON ADMINISTRATION OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE

In addition to the expanded program of grants for research, the Committee on Political Behavior will

continue the series of summer institutes designed to give research scholars in the social and legal fields opportunities for intensive study of the interrelations of the law and other social institutions. Two such institutes have been held under the auspices of the Council's Committee on Research Training, one at Harvard University in 1956 and one at the University of Wisconsin in 1958.

The third institute, on the administration of criminal justice, will be held at the University of Wisconsin from June 27 to August 12, 1960, under the co-direction of Frank J. Remington, Professor of Law, University of Wisconsin, and Victor G. Rosenblum, Director of the Graduate Program in Law and Politics, Northwestern University.

The central theme of the seminar will be the relationship between legal and professional norms as methods of ensuring responsible exercise of official power in current criminal justice administration. Particular emphasis will be given to the sentencing of the convicted offender including constitutional limitations on legislative, judicial, and administrative sentencing practices; the formal allocation of responsibility between the legislature, the judiciary, and administrative agencies; the current roles of formal and professional norms of decision with particular emphasis on the relationship between therapeutic goals and objectives of "due process" in dealing with individual offenders; and limitations on the effectiveness

of control by rule of law resulting from inadequacies of verbal formulation, inadequacies in current knowledge of human behavior, and the necessity of maintaining a system of administration with limited funds, personnel, and time. Some attention will be given also to important police and prosecution decisions. In addition to materials presented by seminar leaders, it is anticipated that participants will have access to the American Bar Foundation's Pilot Report on the Survey of the Administration of Criminal Justice in the United States, which will make it possible to view sentencing and other important decisions in the context of current criminal justice administration; and selected statutory, case, and administrative law materials designed to show the techniques, contributions, and limitations of law as a means for the guidance and control of official action.

Applications to participate in the institute, which will include about 15 persons, are invited from social scientists holding the Ph.D. degree and from legal scholars, preferably not over 40 years of age. Grants will provide round-trip travel fares and maintenance, ranging from \$500 for a single person to \$1,200 for one with several dependents, to participants whose expenses are not defrayed by their own institutions or other sources. Applications must be made on forms provided by the Council and must be received at the office of the Council by February 1, 1960. Notices of admission will be issued not later than March 1.

RESTRUCTURING OF THE COUNCIL'S GENERAL FELLOWSHIP AND GRANT PROGRAMS

RENEWED support received during the past year from the Rockefeller Foundation and the Carnegie Corporation of New York for the Council's general programs of fellowships and grants has provided the occasion for review and proposed restructuring of these programs, which are open to social scientists and students of social science without restriction as to disciplinary fields or areas of substantive interest. While the aggregate amount of funds available for commitment during 1959-60 is about the same as in the current year, it is hoped that the proposed modifications of the programs will permit more adequate response to certain needs than has previously been possible.

The most radical change approved by the Executive Committee of the Council in June affects the program of Faculty Research Fellowships, which has been maintained essentially unaltered since 1950. With a view to

greater flexibility in helping individual scholars take advantage of research opportunities, Faculty Research Fellowships—heretofore subject to rather specifically defined provisions for part-time teaching and research for three-year or in rare cases two-year terms—according to present plans will be offered in full or partial support of research for periods ranging up to two years. This new program of Faculty Research Fellowships will supplant both the previous program of the same title and the previous program of Faculty Research Grants. The upper age limit applicable to the former and the restriction of the latter grants to persons who have held the Ph.D. degree for at least five years will be removed, so that awards may be made to scholars of demonstrated research achievement without regard to age. Stipends for periods of six months to a year may not exceed \$6,000, and the maximum award for research extending

over longer periods ranging up to two years will be \$12,000. The new fellowships may be held in conjunction with sabbatical leaves or grants from other sources, but the holders must be free from teaching or other regular duties during any period for which the fellowships provide maintenance in lieu of salary.

Grants-in-Aid of Research will continue to be offered to scholars who require funds only for travel and other research expenses and whose plans do not include prolonged leaves of absence from regular duties. The ceiling on grants-in-aid will be raised to \$2,000, and stipends may include limited allowances in lieu of earnings to be foregone during academic vacations.

As before, neither Faculty Research Fellowships nor Grants-in-Aid will be available to students working for academic degrees. Tenure of the Ph.D. degree or its equivalent in a social science field will be prerequisite, and an applicant's research achievement will normally be judged on the basis of his previously published work.

Predocctoral and postdoctoral Research Training Fellowships will be offered on the same basis as in the past to Ph.D. candidates and recent recipients of that degree who intend to make careers in research and who wish to broaden or deepen their research training beyond the usual doctoral requirements. Essential qualifications for applicants include not only superior academic performance but also firm commitment to research as a major career objective. The work carried on under a Research Training Fellowship may take the form of advanced study of methods or subject matter not previously mastered, or actual research under suitable guidance, or a combination of the two. Applications will be judged as always in terms of the potential enhancement of the individual's capacity for future research; the intrinsic importance of the research to be done on fellowship is considered relevant only insofar as it may contribute to the former end.

Fellowship support may also be provided for periods ranging up to not more than 12 months to be devoted to completing the writing of doctoral dissertations. This feature of the Council's fellowship program is ancillary to the research training objective just described, its object being to minimize postponement of the doctorate on the part of students who devote large amounts of time—whether on fellowship or not—to acquiring superior competence in research. Applications will thus be accepted either from present or recent holders of the Council's Research Training Fellowships, or from others similarly qualified and committed to research careers; or an applicant may initially request support both for a period of advanced research training and for a period for completion of his dissertation, the combined duration not to exceed two years.

In order to allow more time for preliminary consideration of fellowship applications and for correspondence or interviews with applicants when needed, the closing date for applications for Research Training Fellowships will be advanced to December 1. The volume of applications in relation to the size of the Council's staff no longer permits interviewing of all candidates. An interview cannot be regarded as assurance of an eventual award, but conversely omission of the interview will not necessarily indicate that an application has been eliminated from serious consideration.

Interviews may be found desirable not only with many applicants for Research Training Fellowships but also with some, particularly the younger, applicants for Faculty Research Fellowships. In some of the latter cases it may be necessary to postpone final action on applications filed in November until spring.

In addition to the programs just discussed, a number of specialized programs of fellowships and research grants will be offered. A complete list of these appears on page 36 *infra*.

COMMITTEE BRIEFS

HISTORICAL STATISTICS (Advisory to the Bureau of the Census)

G. Heberton Evans, Jr. (chairman), Otis Dudley Duncan, Solomon Fabricant, Maurice I. Gershenson, Richard M. Scammon, Willard L. Thorp, Harold F. Williamson; *Secretary*, Herman P. Miller.

The revised and expanded edition of *Historical Statistics of the United States* is in press, and publication is expected in December. Two additional essays by consultants of the committee have been published in the *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, in accordance with arrange-

ments made by the committee: "Statistical Data Available for Economic Research on Certain Types of Recreation," by Marion Clawson, in the March 1959 issue; "A Guide to the Literature on Statistics of Religious Affiliation with References to Related Social Studies," by Benson Y. Landis, in the June issue.

HISTORY OF SCIENCE (Joint with National Research Council)

Richard H. Shryock (chairman), I. Bernard Cohen, Henry Guerlac, Mark H. Ingraham, R. B. Lindsay, Robert K. Merton, H. L. Shapiro, Gordon R. Willey.

The proceedings of the Institute on the History of Science that was held at the University of Wisconsin, September 1-11, 1957, under the sponsorship of the joint committee were published by the University of Wisconsin Press in July 1959. *Critical Problems in the History of Science*, edited by Marshall Clagett, who served as director of the Institute, contains the 16 major papers prepared for the Institute and 19 commentaries on them.

MATHEMATICS IN SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH

William G. Madow (chairman), Carl F. Christ, Sanford M. Dornbusch, John G. Kemeny, James G. March, Philip J. McCarthy, George A. Miller, Anatol Rapoport; staff, Elbridge Sibley.

Studies in Mathematical Learning Theory, edited by Robert R. Bush and William K. Estes, has just been published by the Stanford University Press as Stanford Mathematical Studies in the Social Sciences, III. This 440-page volume is an outgrowth of one of the five workshops conducted at the Summer Institute on Applications of Mathematics in Social Science Research, which was held at Stanford University in the summer of 1957, under the auspices of the committee's predecessor, the Council's Committee on Mathematical Training of Social Scientists.

SLAVIC STUDIES

(Joint with American Council of Learned Societies)

William B. Edgerton (chairman), Robert F. Byrnes (secretary), Abram Bergson, C. E. Black, Merle Fainsod, Chauncy D. Harris, Charles Jelavich, Henry L. Roberts, Marshall D. Shulman, Ernest J. Simmons, S. Harrison Thomson, Sergius Yakobson.

The two-year review of Russian studies in the United States, which was initiated in May 1957 under the auspices

of the joint committee, has been completed by the special subcommittee appointed for the purpose—Messrs. Black (chairman), Byrnes, Jelavich, Roberts, Melville J. Ruggles, Shulman, and Treadgold, and John M. Thompson as staff. Published results of the review are beginning to appear. The Indiana University Press will publish *American Research on Russia*, edited by Harold H. Fisher with an introduction by Philip E. Mosely, on September 15, 1959, and *The Study of Russia in American Education*, edited by C. E. Black and John M. Thompson, shortly thereafter. *Russian and East European Publications in Libraries of the United States*, the study by Melville J. Ruggles and Vaclav Mostecky that the Association of Research Libraries was asked to undertake as a separate but complementary survey, will be published in the Slavic and East European Series of Indiana University in the fall of 1959. A summary report of the entire two-year review will appear in the *American Slavic and East European Review*, October 1959.

The joint committee's Subcommittee on Grants—Messrs. Bergson (chairman), Frederick C. Barghoorn, Deming Brown, Harris, and Treadgold—has made two grants for travel to international conferences this summer: to Robert S. Lopez, Professor of History, Yale University, for participation in the conference on Medieval Industrial and Urban Life in Poland, Warsaw, August 31–September 12, under the auspices of the University of Warsaw; and to Udo Posch, Assistant Professor of Far Eastern and Slavic Languages and Literature, University of Washington, for participation in the First International Congress of Mongolist Philologists, Ulan Bator, September 1–7, sponsored by the Institute of Language and Letters of the Committee on Sciences and Higher Education, Mongolian People's Republic.

PUBLICATIONS

COUNCIL BOOKS AND MONOGRAPHS

The State and Economic Growth: Papers of a Conference Held on October 11–13, 1956, under the Auspices of the Committee on Economic Growth, edited by Hugh G. J. Aitken. May 1959. 399 pages. Cloth, \$3.75.

Migration and Mental Disease: A Study of First Admissions to Hospitals for Mental Disease, New York, 1939–1941, by Benjamin Malzberg and Everett S. Lee, with an introduction by Dorothy S. Thomas. Sponsored by the Committee on Migration Differentials. March 1956. 152 pages. \$1.50.

Labor Mobility in Six Cities, prepared by Gladys L. Palmer, with the assistance of Carol P. Brainerd, for the former Committee on Labor Market Research. June 1954. 191 pages. Paper, \$2.25; cloth, \$2.75.

COUNCIL PAMPHLETS: MEMORANDA TO THE COMMITTEE ON PREVENTIVE MEDICINE AND SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH

Effects of Social and Cultural Systems in Reactions to Stress, Pamphlet 14, by William Caudill. June 1958. 39 pages. 50 cents.

Social Status and Public Health, Pamphlet 13, by Ozzie G. Simmons. May 1958. 39 pages. 50 cents.

Problems in Intercultural Health Programs, Pamphlet 12, by George M. Foster. April 1958. 54 pages. 50 cents.

Special price for the three pamphlets together, \$1.00.

These pamphlets and other publications of the Council are distributed from its office, 230 Park Avenue, New York 17, N. Y.

CENSUS MONOGRAPHS

These volumes, in the series sponsored by the former Committee on Census Monographs and the Bureau of the Census, are published by John Wiley & Sons, New York:

The American Labor Force, by Gertrude Bancroft. October 1958. 270 pages. Cloth, \$7.50.

The Fertility of American Women, by Wilson H. Grabill, Clyde V. Kiser, and P. K. Whelpton. August 1958. 464 pages. Cloth, \$9.50.

The Changing Population of the United States, by Conrad Taeuber and Irene B. Taeuber. January 1958. 368 pages. Cloth, \$7.75.

COUNCIL FELLOWSHIPS AND GRANTS OFFERED IN 1959-60: DATES FOR FILING APPLICATIONS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS OF AWARDS

Applications for fellowships and grants offered by the Council during the coming year will be due, and awards will be announced, on or before the respective dates listed below. Because full consideration cannot be assured for late applications, and because preliminary correspondence is frequently necessary to determine under which program a given proposal should be submitted, prospective applicants should communicate with the Council if possible at least three weeks in advance of the pertinent closing date. Inquiries and requests for application forms should indicate the candidate's age, place of permanent residence, present position or activity, degrees held and degree currently sought if any, the general nature of the proposed training or research, and the duration or amount of support desired. A brochure describing the several programs is available on request addressed to the Social Science Research Council Fellowships and Grants, 230 Park Avenue, New York 17, N. Y.; and as indicated below, descriptions of new programs offered for the first time appear elsewhere in this issue of *Items*:

Research Training Fellowships, and Fellowships for Completion of Doctoral Dissertations (see page 34 *supra*), applications, December 1, 1959; awards, April 1, 1960

Fellowships in Political Theory and Legal Philosophy, applications, December 1, 1959; awards, April 1, 1960

Summer Research Training Institute on Administration of Criminal Justice (see pages 32-33), applications, February 1, 1960; notices of admission, March 1, 1960

Faculty Research Fellowships, and Grants-in-Aid of Research (see pages 33-34), *first competition*: applications, November 2, 1959; awards, January 4, 1960; *second competition*: applications, February 1, 1960; awards, April 1, 1960

Senior Research Awards in American Governmental Affairs, applications, November 2, 1959; awards, January 1960

Grants for Research on American Governmental and Legal Processes (see page 32), applications, December 7, 1959; awards, February 15, 1960

Grants for Research on National Security Policy (see *Items*, March 1959, pages 4-5), applications, November 16, 1959; awards, January 15, 1960

*Grants for Asian Studies, applications to be submitted to American Council of Learned Societies, 345 East 46 Street, New York 17, N. Y., November 2, 1959; awards, January 15, 1960

*Grants for Latin American Studies (see page 31), applications, January 4, 1960; awards, March 15, 1960

*Grants for Near and Middle Eastern Studies, applications, November 2, 1959; awards, January 4, 1960

*Grants for Slavic and East European Studies, applications, November 2, 1959; awards, January 4, 1960

International Conference Travel Grants, applications, December 1, 1959; awards, February 1, 1960, for the following meetings:

International Congress of Americanists

International Congress of Economic History

International Congress of Historical Sciences

International Geographical Union

International Statistical Institute

International Union of Anthropological and Ethnological Sciences

International Union of Scientific Psychology

Travel Grants for conferences on Slavic and East European Studies, applications, March 1, 1960 for summer conferences, or earlier for conferences to be held in the winter or spring

* Offered to research scholars in the social sciences and humanities, under a joint program of the American Council of Learned Societies and the Social Science Research Council.

SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH COUNCIL

230 PARK AVENUE, NEW YORK 17, N. Y.

Incorporated in the State of Illinois, December 27, 1924, for the purpose of advancing research in the social sciences

Directors, 1959: GARDNER ACKLEY, GABRIEL A. ALMOND, HAROLD F. DORN, FRED EGGAN, ROBERT E. L. FARIS, R. A. GORDON, LOUIS GOTTSCHALK, CHAUNCEY D. HARRIS, PENDLETON HERRING, E. ADAMSON HOEBEL, WAYNE H. HOLTZMAN, NATHAN KEYFITZ, LYLE H. LANIER, EARL LATHAM, AVERY LEISERSON, EDWARD H. LEVI, PHILIP J. MCCARTHY, DOUGLAS MCGREGOR, WILLIAM H. NICHOLLS, DAVID M. POTTER, H. L. SHAPIRO, CARROLL L. SHARTLE, RICHARD H. SHRYOCK, HERBERT A. SIMON, CONRAD TAEUBER, GORDON R. WILLEY, MALCOLM M. WILLEY, ROBIN M. WILLIAMS, JR., C. VANN WOODWARD, DONALD YOUNG

Officers and Staff: PENDLETON HERRING, *President*; PAUL WEBBINK, *Vice-President*; ELBRIDGE SIBLEY, *Executive Associate*; BRYCE WOOD; ELEANOR C. ISBELL; JOSEPH B. CASAGRANDE; CATHERINE V. RONNAN, *Financial Secretary*